

Department of the Classics, Harvard University

Some Byzantine Accounting Practices Illustrated from Georgian Sources

Author(s): Robert P. Blake

Source: *Harvard Studies in Classical Philology*, Vol. 51, In Honor of William Scott Ferguson (1940), pp. 11-33

Published by: [Department of the Classics, Harvard University](#)

Stable URL: <http://www.jstor.org/stable/310920>

Accessed: 21/08/2013 22:07

Your use of the JSTOR archive indicates your acceptance of the Terms & Conditions of Use, available at <http://www.jstor.org/page/info/about/policies/terms.jsp>

JSTOR is a not-for-profit service that helps scholars, researchers, and students discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content in a trusted digital archive. We use information technology and tools to increase productivity and facilitate new forms of scholarship. For more information about JSTOR, please contact support@jstor.org.



Department of the Classics, Harvard University is collaborating with JSTOR to digitize, preserve and extend access to *Harvard Studies in Classical Philology*.

<http://www.jstor.org>

SOME BYZANTINE ACCOUNTING PRACTICES ILLUSTRATED FROM GEORGIAN SOURCES

BY ROBERT P. BLAKE

ONE of the chief differences between the history of Byzantium and that of the western mediaeval world lies in the extreme paucity of charters and private documents originating in the Levant.¹ Documents of the earlier centuries are rare enough in the west, it is true, but from the 11th century onward materials become more abundant, and this richness increases in quasi-geometric progression as we approach the Renaissance. Documents in Byzantium also become more frequent in the later period, but in the final centuries of the Eastern Empire's existence, its economic star had set, and such information as we obtain is devoid of the importance which would have attached to documents issued in its heyday. Any extraneous evidence of economic importance, therefore, which bears on the earlier period of Byzantine history, is of considerable value. It is the object of this paper to call attention to some facts preserved in Georgian sources, which illustrate a few of the effects which the changing pattern of Byzantine economic life imposed upon its citizens. The data preserved, scanty as they are, enable us to observe some minor results of the depreciation which affected Byzantine currency during the 11th century.

The lack of documents in extant Byzantine sources is due to various reasons, a few of which we can briefly touch upon here. The repeated devastations which overtook the Eastern Empire during the thousand years of the empire's existence, were perhaps in the main but little more destructive than those which occurred in many sections of Western Europe. The thread of historical continuity, however, which

¹ Byzantine documents will be included in the Munich corpus of such materials, if this should ever be completed (cf. p. 22, n. 1). A list of the older publications in Krumbacher, *Geschichte der byzantinischen Litteratur*, 2d ed., pp. 223-4. Among these the most important are Miklosich und Müller, *Acta et Diplomata Graeca*, 6 voll., Vienna, 1860-90, and C. Sathas, *Μνημεῖα Ἑλληνικῆς Ἱστορίας*, 10 voll., Paris, 1880-90. A considerable body of documents are scattered about in divers periodicals. More recent publications are listed in the bibliographies of the *Byzantinische Zeitschrift*, the *Vizantiiskii Vremennik* and *Byzantion*.

runs through Western European history down to present times, was broken in the Levant by the two captures of Constantinople in 1204 and in 1453. The Byzantine state was at all periods more centralized than were the kingdoms of the west, where the independent position of the Roman Catholic Church gave a resiliency to the ecclesiastical organization in particular which was wholly lacking in the Balkans or in Asia Minor. The cartularies of western cloisters are numbered by the thousands; in the Levant we count them by tens. The municipal archives of western cities have survived in large measure, but in the east the charters of the provincial and municipal governments have vanished almost without a trace. Lastly, the archives of the imperial government have perished save for a portion of the seals which were attached to them, while in the west the state archives have in the main survived. We know a good deal about the history and the internal structure of the Byzantine government; in certain ways workers in this field are better off than western mediaeval historians, but we lack the data for checking the details of the administration, central and local, which our western sources provide.

Byzantine historians, it is true, continually refer to documents of an official nature, and in some instances give us synopses of them, but any quotation of them *in extenso* and *ad verbum* was barred by the canons of literary custom. This material has been collected from the sources by Dölger and published in the first three fascicules of his *Regesten der byzantinischen Kaiserurkunden* up to 1282.¹ All these documents, however, have to do with the activities of the central government, and give us no insight into everyday life — especially in its economic aspects.

Constantinople, during the early middle ages, was one of the most famous marts of the world. From all over the civilized globe merchants streamed to the city; every kind of product and ware could be obtained here.² Economically speaking, the city was an *entrepôt*: the

¹ *Corpus der griechischen Urkunden des Mittelalters und der neueren Zeit*, herausgegeben von den Akademien der Wissenschaften in München und Wien. Reihe A: Regesten. Abteilung 1: Regesten der Kaiserurkunden des oströmischen Reiches, bearbeitet von Franz Dölger, 1 Teil: Regesten von 565–1025; 2 Teil: Regesten von 1025–1204; 3 Teil: Regesten von 1205–1282. München und Berlin, 1924–32.

² The fullest list of these products which we possess is contained in the tractate of

majority of the raw products which were displayed in the bazars originated in territories outside the empire, and many of the articles there manufactured were dependent on extraneous materials. The commercial dominance of Byzantium in the Eastern Mediterranean was accordingly not due to her own natural resources, nor to the initiative of her merchants, but to her unrivalled geographical position and to the inherent soundness of the empire's economic structure. The Byzantine state, economically speaking, was passive, but the commercial balance was in its favor; this fortunate conjuncture was brought about and maintained by the Byzantine system of currency, whose influence was felt throughout the Mediterranean, and over large parts of Europe and Asia.

The most striking testimony as to the commercial dominance of the empire is afforded by the use of the *νόμισμα* (aureus or bezant) as *monnaie de compte* over a large part of the Mediterranean basin.¹ This hegemony was aided and abetted by the fact that the Mahometan dinars were coined upon the same standard, and, it would appear, passed current interchangeably in many areas. From Anastasius I until the middle of the 11th century the bezant remained unchanged in purity and weight,² while its Mahometan counterparts, coined as

Fr. Balducci Pegolotti, *Pratica della Mercatura* (ca. 1342), pp. 33-40 (ed. Allan Evans, Cambridge, 1936). A cursory perusal of the material herein contained shows that in the main it is of foreign origin.

¹ H. Gelzer, *Byzantinische Kulturgeschichte* (Tübingen, 1909), p. 78, quoted by J. B. Bury, *The Eastern Roman Empire* (Cambridge, 1912), p. 221. "In the period of 800 years from Diocletian to Alexis Comnenus the Roman government never found itself compelled to declare bankruptcy or stop payments. . . . This prodigious stability of Roman financial policy therefore secured the "byzant" its universal currency. On account of its full weight it passed with all the neighboring nations as a valid medium of exchange. By her money Byzantium controlled both the civilized and the barbarian worlds." See also the materials collected by A. Schaube, *Handelsgeschichte der romanischen Völker des Mittelmeergebiets bis zum Ende der Kreuzzüge* (München und Berlin, 1906), p. 3 ff.

² Certain chroniclers accuse Nicephorus Phocas of having lessened the weight of the bezant along with sundry other financial sins (Cedrenus ed. Bonn, v. 2, p. 369; Zonaras ed. Bonn, v. 3, p. 507). Wroth doubts this (*Catalogue of the Imperial Byzantine Coins in the British Museum*, vol. I (London, 1908), Introduction, p. 1) as the extant coins show no trace of such oscillation. It is to be observed, however, that from 1028 on there were two distinct types of bezant struck at Constantinople,

time went on in widely separated areas, underwent perceptible fluctuations. Only in the 11th century, when the *conflit funeste* between the military and the civil bureaucracy became acute and envenomed,¹ was the standard of the currency changed for the worse.

It is not the author's intention to discuss in this paper either the causes of this change or the devastating effects of the depreciation, but merely to illustrate one phase of the latter from certain documents, which hitherto have not been utilized for the purpose. Any change in the value of an accounting unit invalidates its main purpose — to state in fixed terms of value (based either on precious metal content or purchasing power) the *montant* of sums of other currency or of goods purchased or sold during business transactions. Once the unit varies, it becomes useless as a standard, except perchance it be transmuted into a putative, *als ob* quantity. Within the political area where it had official course, its oscillations in value must of necessity be registered by booking or posting separately its different types and values. The days of doubloons and moidores, of old gold mohurs, of Spanish, Maria Theresa, and trade dollars are not far removed from our own experience. Traces of such practices in the eastern empire can be gleaned in some cases from late Byzantine documents and from early Italian sources, but local evidence from the 11th and 12th centuries is scanty in the extreme.

The documents we deal with concern benefactions bestowed during the 11th and 12th centuries upon the Imperial Lavra of Iviron on Mount Athos.² This cloister was founded by the Georgian ascete St.

which differed both in form (one being scyphate) and in weight (62 and 68 grains). We may have in this statement an anachronistic transfer of later conditions back upon Nicephorus Phocas.

¹ On this see G. L. Schlumberger, *L'épopée byzantine à la fin du x^e siècle*, vol. III (Paris, 1896), pp. 385–830, and for the period after 1057, the old but excellent book of N. A. Skabalanovich, *Византийское Государство и Церковь въ XI вѣкѣ отъ смерти Басилія II Болгаробойца до воцаренія Алексѣя I Комнина*. С. Перербургъ 1884 г.

² The only separate monograph on the history of the cloister is that of A. Натроевъ, *Иверскій Монастырь на Аѳонѣ, Тифлисъ 1898 г.* which is not accessible to me here. The general books on Athos (Gedeon, Smyrnakis, Brockhaus, Porphyrii Uspenskii) touch somewhat on the affairs of Iviron. Much information is given by P. Peeters in his *Histoires monastiques géorgiennes* (see below, p. 20, n. 2) in his notes on the translations of the lives of St. Euthymius and of St. George.

John the Athonite somewhere around the year 981. This dignitary was a Georgian of good lineage and influential connections, who withdrew to monastic life after having been married and having raised a family. His family name is not quite certain, but was probably Khursisdze.¹ He first entered the monastery of the Four Churches somewhere in the Caucasus, whose exact location is uncertain.² Thence he came to Byzantine territory, and for a time resided on Mt. Olympus in Bithynia, near Brussa. His youngest son, Euthymius, had meantime been sent to Constantinople as a hostage, and his father succeeded in obtaining possession of the boy through the intercession of one of his relations, Abu Harb, who had much influence with the imperial court. Somewhere around the year 975, John moved to the new monastic center at Mt. Athos. Euthymius followed him not long after (ca. 979), and ere long father and son were joined by their relative, the famous general Ivané T'ornik. Others of their countrymen followed, and the plan was soon set on foot, with the approval of Saint Athanasius, of founding a new monastery. It had been the original intention of the founders to have only Georgians in the cloister, but this restriction proved not to be practical, and from the beginning Greek brethren were also admitted.

T'ornik had been a famous general, and his monastic career was interrupted by an enforced interlude of military activity, when he was largely responsible for crushing the revolt of Bardas Skleros against the imperial authority.³ He was a wealthy seigneur in his own right,⁴ and the largesses of his imperial masters at the termination of his successful expedition made his financial status all the more flourishing.⁵ Whether John himself had retained control over any of his own

¹ *Journal of Theological Studies* 26 (1924), pp. 54-57: the biographical data are drawn from the life (tr. Peeters, *l. c.*, pp. 16-18).

² From a note of Père Peeters (*Anal. Boll.* L, 1932, 370, note 5) it appears that this cloister has been located by E. T'aqaišvili in the T'ort'um valley.

³ On the details see Schlumberger *Épopée* *l. c.*; *Vita S. Euthymii*, tr. Peeters, pp. 20. 1-22. 20.

⁴ The family estates were located near Zarzma in southern Georgia (see E. S. T'aqaišvili in *Сборникъ Матеріаловъ для описанія мѣстностей и племенъ Кавказа*, XXXV (1905), pp. 1-80), where the church contains some inscriptions by members of the family.

⁵ *Vita Euthymii*, tr. Peeters, p. 22. 10 ff., 23. 19-24 (see below, p. 20, n. 2). T'ornik

property does not appear directly: it would seem that his resources were in large measure derived from T'ornik, who had turned his property over to John.¹

In any event T'ornik and John between them provided the funds necessary for the construction of the monastery.² The Georgians had originally been located in the monastery of St. John the Evangelist: this is probably an error in our source for St. John the Baptist — i.e., the Σκήπη τοῦ Προδρόμου.³ T'ornik on his return from the campaign against Skleros, brought back great riches — 1200 pounds of treasure alone (\$297,464), and many other precious objects.⁴ These funds were obviously used to construct the cloister — ἡ βασιλικὴ Λαύρα τῶν Ἱβήρων. George the Athonite tells us that he drew these figures from the papers of St. Euthymius,⁵ and no doubt the other donations of money and precious objects which George mentions come from the same source. I summarize here such of them as involve actual sums of money:

(1) Assignment to the Lavra of a pension of 84 nomismata per annum, granted to T'ornik by the emperor John Tzimisces.

(2) Gift of the island of Neos, whereof the yearly income oscillated between 10 and 20 lbs. of gold.

(3) To the Protatou for general distribution in 980, 14 lbs.; in 983, 11 lbs.: and in 984, after T'ornik's death, 18 lbs.

(4) Houses and vineyard at Ἱερισσός, whose income was calculated at 6 lbs. of gold per annum. Euthymius gave likewise 200 nomismata to the Protatou.

had retired to a monastery in the Caucasus, possibly to Oška. Here at all events he had copied for himself two important manuscripts, which are still preserved at Iviron (nos. 1 and 9: see *ROChr* XXVIII 302–305 and *Harvard Theological Review* 1929, 33 ff.), and at least one other, as the memorial found by the writer and Professor K. Lake in ms. no. 62 Vladimir of the former Synodal library at Moscow shows (published by P. Peeters in *Analecta Bollandiana* L (1932), pp. 358–71 under the title *Un colophon géorgien de Thornik le moine*). To have had these mss. copied must have cost a large sum.

¹ This is specifically stated in the *Vita*, p. 23. 24–30: note also the gentleness with which John rebukes T'ornik because of his yearning for tales of battle (*l. c.*, p. 24. 12–35).

² *Vita*, p. 23. 19–24, 24. 39 ff.

³ *Vita*, p. 19, note 4.

⁴ *Vita*, p. 23. 20–21 and 25. 4–28. 2.

⁵ *Vita*, 27. 13–14.

It should be noted that none of these benefactions are referred to *nominatim* in the memorials which we are about to describe, but only *summatim*.¹

A fortunate chance has preserved for us in a Georgian ms. written on Mt. Athos a list of the benefactors of Iviron, comprising also in many instances a summary account of their benefactions. The notices or memorials themselves, with but one or two exceptions, contain no date. The earlier series of them refer to events antedating the year 1074 A.D., when the main body of the ms. was written; the bulk of the remainder, written by the hand of a second scribe, falls before the year 1116 A.D.; sundry additions were made to both parts of the list later on, either on the margin or at the end. The notices contain first of all the details of the liturgical commemoration prescribed for the departed,² but in many cases the scribe mentions the specific benefactions of the deceased to the monastery. In some instances these were not financial, but took the form of intervention before highly-placed officials from the emperors down; in other cases actual gifts are mentioned.

This type of ms. is termed in Georgian სჯნდოი, from the Greek συνοδικόν. The first use of the expression with which I am familiar is as a title of one of the works of St. Athanasius of Alexandria.³ Its implication seems to be that of a corpus or collection dealing with a

¹ Memorials nos. 1, 71, 83.

² Part of this consists not infrequently of one or more კნახველი κερασοβολιον, in addition to the strictly liturgical prescriptions: see nos. 1, 34, 38, etc.

³ The term συνοδικόν is cited as the name of a work of St. Athanasius of Alexandria in the *Church History* of Socrates Scholasticus (1. 13). The Greek original is not extant, and a considerable literature has grown up about this passage. Fr. Geppert (*Die Quellen des Kirchenhistorikers Socrates Scholasticus*, Leipzig, 1898) endeavored to reconstruct it, and the process was carried out further by P. Battifol (*Byz. Zs.* X (1901), pp. 128 ff.) who endeavored to identify it with the collection of Theophilus the Deacon in the Verona ms. and by G. Loeschke (*Rh. Mus.* N. F. LIX (1904), pp. 451–70, who equated it with a σύνταγμα of documents preserved in the corpus mss. of Athanasius. Ed. Schwartz (*Nachr. GGW*, ph.-hist. Kl. 1904, pp. 357–401) disagrees with Battifol, and adduces certain catena quotations of the document from a Florentine ms. Bardenhewer (*Geschichte der altchristlichen Literatur* III, pp. 62–3) agrees with Schwartz; he points out (*l. c.* 70, note 1) that the expression συνοδικόν is employed by Gregory Nazianzen (*Ep.* 101 *ad Cledonium*, Migne, *P. G.* 37. 177) ἡ διὰ τόμου συνοδικοῦ ἢ δι' ἐπιστολῶν κοινωνικῶν. This passage shows that the term was current in the fourth century.

definite affair, like the Russian *сводъ*. I am not familiar with any *terminus technicus* from the Latin mediaeval world which affords a precise equivalent. Such *synodikà* arose out of a natural need in monastic existence. Over a long period a cloister, especially if located at a place frequented by pilgrims, would receive a series of gifts and benefactions. The idea of a guest-book apparently never occurred to the Georgians nor to the Greeks either, but in its stead a notice was inserted at a suitable point in a manuscript, often liturgical in character, or sometimes in one given by the donor. If the amount of the gift were large and accompanied by documents and charters, such a brief notation might not necessarily be made.¹

In the majority of cases the donation was made in conjunction with a specific request that the donor, and oftentimes certain members of his family,² be mentioned by name once or more³ a year during the services. This often took place on the giver's saint's day,⁴ but sometimes another occasion was chosen. This commemoration was called in Georgian *სიძის აგაპი*⁵ from the Greek *ἀγάπη*. In certain cases this commemoration might involve a special service. To keep these in mind a collection of such indications needed to be made, and some extant Georgian materials illustrate how this came about. Either a list was drawn up and attached to a specific ms., or else the data were entered as they came in on a specific ms. The *synodikon* of Iviron exemplifies the first procedure, and that of the monastery of the Holy Cross near Jerusalem, the second.⁶ Card-indexes and files did not enter

¹ This circumstance perhaps explains why we have no details given in our ms. in the memorials of T'ornik, John and Euthymius (see above, p. 17, n. 1).

² Cf. nos. 76, 77, 150, etc.

³ Cf. nos. 9 and 141; 3 and 25; 56, 73 and 96; 24 and 55, etc.

⁴ All those who have had experience of orthodox countries are aware of the great importance of this festival for everyone, no matter what his social position.

⁵ The word was borrowed during the Byzantine period, as the mediaeval and modern Greek pronunciation of *γ* as a velar before a hard vowel is reflected in the Georgian transcription *ღ gh*.

⁶ This interesting document is preserved on the margins of mss. Georg. 24 and 25 of the Greek Patriarchal Library at Jerusalem (*ROChr* XXIII 406-7), which contain the synaxary of St. George the Athonite. The memorials have been published by N. Marr, *Bibliotheca Armeno-Georgica* III (1914): *Синодикъ Крестнаго Монастыря въ Иерусалимѣ*.

The Sinai *synodikon* (A. A. Цагарели, *Свѣдѣнія* etc., II, pp. 76-79 in ms. no.

into monastic recording practices during the middle ages, and systematization was by no means carried too far.¹ Thanks, however, to the activities of two Athonite monks, we are in a position to glean a considerable amount of valuable information on the pilgrims who visited, or corresponded with, the monastery, and the extent to which they enriched the foundation by their donations, either proffered in person or dispatched thither from abroad.

In the year 1074 Mik'el Daγalisoneli, a Georgian monk at the Laura of Iviron on Mt. Athos, wrote a manuscript at the behest of the *δεκανός* (archpriest) Iakob, who paid for the parchment.² This was at the time when Giorgi Olt'isari was higumen, and this period, as we can see from the colophons of the Georgian mss. preserved in the library, marks a recrudescence of Georgian, as opposed to Greek influence in the monastery.³

The ms. contains the following productions:

(1) Life of St. Euthymius the Athonite, written by St. George the Athonite, ff. 2v-65r.

(2) Life of St. Ilarion the Georgian, ff. 65r-83r.

(3) Translation of his relics, ff. 83r-88v.

(4) Memorial service for St. Euthymius (May 13), ff. 88v-89r.

(5) Acta Iohannis apostoli a Prochoro scripta, translated into Georgian by St. Euthymius, ff. 89v-159r.

(6) Colophon of scribe, pp. 308-311 (p. 312 is partly blank: in this space a modern colophon has been written: cf. ed. p. 176).

(7) Chants (*dasdebulni*) in honor of St. Ilarion, pp. 312-324.

54 (now 77)) is a late copy of a brief list, much like a similar document at Jerusalem, of which a fragment was published by Marr (*l. c.*, pp. xxv-xxviii).

¹ Both Mik'el and Ioanē endeavored to follow a chronological arrangement in accordance with the ecclesiastical year, but neither was able to carry out the scheme fully.

² Pp. 308-11 of ms. The name of the scribe is Daγalisoneli, not Galisoneli, as Peeters (after Zhordania) gives it.

³ See the colophon of ms. 30 (*ROChr* XXIX 148-150): Olt'isari is an adjective of locality signifying from Olt'i (in Adjara). It is not a common type of formation in Georgian, but we can compare the form მთებური *mtevari* from Tbet' in Šavšet'ia, an epithet applied to bishop Ivanē in the colophons of the Tbet' Gospels (Царепели, Свѣдѣнія Выпускъ I, pp. 17-22; to be republished in the writer's edition of the Gospel of John in the *Patrologia Orientalis*) and to the scribe Aquila in ms. geor. no. 28 at Iviron (*ROChr* XXIX 143-147).

(8) Chants in honor of St. John the Georgian, the father of St. Euthymius, pp. 324–351.

(9) Other chants for the same saint, pp. 352–364.

(10) *Aγapni* of the Laura: these are in part by the hand of the basic scribe, in part by others; we shall return to them below. At the end there are some late memorials on the fly-leaf. Pp. 364–425.

The ms. remained at Iviron until the first part of the 19th century, when the Georgian monk Ilarion,¹ who had been the confessor of the last Georgian king of Imeret'ia, Solomon II (d. 1815 at Trebizond), abstracted it and sent it to the Caucasus. Here it fell into the hands of the Dadiani family, and thence passed to the Ecclesiastical Museum at Tiflis.

In 1901 the codex was published *in toto* at Tiflis by M. G. Djanashvili and A. S. Khakhanashvili under the title *A Manuscript of Athonite Iviron of the year 1074 with Memorials*, and a description of it appeared as no. 558 in the following year in the catalogue of the Museum's collection of mss. compiled by Th. Zhordania.² Appended to the text of the ms. proper in the edition is the life of St. George the Athonite from ms. 170 of the Ecclesiastical Museum.³ Though the edition can hardly be called critical, it gives a reasonably good presentation of the text. Its most regrettable drawback lies in the inadequate palaeographical description given of the memorials. This I am in a position to supplement to some extent by observations made on the ms. at Tiflis in 1918.

The order of the memorials in the manuscript is as follows: the first scribe of the manuscript, Mik'el Dayalisoneli, wrote those numbered 1, 11–13, 15–20, 23–26, 31, 33–35, 37, 45–7. Mik'el's entries follow in

¹ On Ilarion see V. Langlois, *Jour. As., Sér, VI, t. IX* (1867), pp. 335–7, and *ROChr* XXVIII 297. The ms. was actually brought to the Caucasus by the monk V. Barkalaia (Venedikton? Cf. *ROChr, l. c.*).

² Θ. Жорданія, Описаніе рукописей Тифлискаго церковнаго музея карталино-кахетинскаго духовенства II (Тифлисъ 1902 г.), pp. 85–86. The editors had designated the ms. as no. 529 of the monastery of Iviron. On the identification see Paul Peeters, *Histoires monastiques géorgiennes* (extr. of *Anal. Boll. T. XXXVI–XXXVII*). The learned author here gives an annotated Latin translation of the lives of St. John and Euthymius (pp. 8–68). He had published the life of St. Ilarion earlier (*Anal. Boll. XXXII*, pp. 243–69).

³ Жорданія, *l. c. supra*, v. I (1903), pp. 178–80.

rough chronological order, with the exception of no. 1, the commemoration of T'ornik (Dec. 15), and begin with the first of December; the date is interesting, as it would lead us to infer that Mik'el was not basing his collection on any notes in a liturgical manuscript, which would have begun, as is customary in orthodox circles, with September 1. The memorials run, save for later insertions, to the end of January. The chronological order of Mik'el's own notations show some slight aberrations, which leads us to infer that he had come across new materials in the course of his researches, and furthermore that he did not finish his task. Iované T'ablaysdze took up where his predecessor left off, and continued in chronological order down to the end of November (no. 139 — Nov. 30). Iované tells us that he brought the list up to date at the request of John, the higumen of the monastery.¹ Without having checked exhaustively the chronology of the persons Iované mentions, it would seem that the majority of these notices refer to the period between 1074 and 1116, though a few seem to hark back to an earlier time. As in the case of Mik'el's section, a number of memorials have been added to Iované's list by different hands, some on the margins and others on leaves specially inserted. In the ensuing discussion we shall denote the main scribes as (M. D.) and (Io. T') respectively.

After this come a series of later inserts, in part on added leaves, dating perhaps from the time of Abbot Pavlé (No. 165 = 1170), preceding the actual colophon of Iované (No. 166). No. 162 (a. 1498) in particular is inserted on a sheet of white parchment with gold initials of the Meskhian type.

Before we take up the details given in these memorials, it seems prudent to review the evidence which is afforded by imperial documents concerning the manner in which large sums are stated: the data are conveniently assembled by Dölger.² Two systems are employed in the main: the figures are given either in nomismata or else in pounds of gold. It must also be borne in mind in this connection that in most instances we do not have the text of the document itself, but at best a summary of it. In some cases, therefore, it may well be that the author

¹ No. 166 (pp. 273-4).

² Title cited above, p. 12, note 1.

has recalculated the sum in a manner different from that which stood in the original.

Payments of tribute in the main form the largest single category of considerable sums. These are calculated almost without exception in nomismata or in dinars.¹ Annuities and pensions are generally specified in monetary form,² but fines and especially bequests are usually given by weight. It may easily be in the case of some bequests that the sum was merely an *adaeratio* reckoned from other goods and species.

In the 11th century the diversity of units becomes much more definitely marked: under Alexius Comnenus we have two instances where a definite type of coin is specified — a payment to Bohemund in *Michailati* and one to Henry IV, Emperor of Germany, in silver coins.³

The basic designations of coins employed in the memorials are few in number: in fact, if we make an exception for one dated 15th century memorial (no. 164), there are only two. These are *drahkani* and *perperay* (or *perperati*). The remainder of the expressions encountered

¹ In the following list we give Dölger's number within parentheses; unbracketed figures denote the date: (31) Tribute paid to the Persians, 45,000 nomismata — 574; (64) tribute 50,000 nomismata — 582; (131) 20,000 nomismata additional on the Avar tribute — 600; (171) 20,000 nomismata as tribute to the Avars — 617; (220) 12,000,000 dinars in tribute to the Arabs from Egypt — 641; (230) Arabs pay empire tribute of 1000 dinars a day, one horse and one Christian slave — 659; (239) Arabs pay tribute (amount uncertain) in same form as previous item — 678; (253) tribute from Arabs 365,000 dinars — 685; (257) tribute from Arabs of 1000 dinars per day (or week) — 688; (340) tribute to Arabs paid in nomismata — 781; (366) tribute to Arabs 30,000 nomismata — 806; (603) tribute to Fatimids 11,000 nomismata — 924; (644) Arabs turn over to the empire 200 captives and 12,000 pieces of silver — 944.

² Annuities and pensions: (118) 30 lbs. of gold to pope for alms — 595; (300) income of papal estates in the Eastern Empire amounting to 3½ talents of gold confiscated to the imperial treasury — 731; (704) *σολέμνιον* to Laura of St. Athanasius 244 nomismata annually — ca. 964. Fines: (33) imperial novella: 10 lbs. of gold — 574; (237) 100 lbs. of gold — 677.

³ Anna Comnena 13. 12 (ed. Rifferscheid 2. 220, ll. 8–10) a pension of 200 talents (here = probably lbs.) of gold granted to Bohemund to be paid in coinage of the emperor Michael; *eiusdem* 3. 10 (ed. Rifferscheid 1. 121, ll. 23–25) 144,000 bezants to be paid in silver and Romanati (a. 1081) *καὶ τὸ ῥηθὲν ποσὸν τῶν ἀποσταλόντων ἀπεπληρώθη διὰ τε εἰργασμένου ἀργύρου καὶ Ῥωμανάτου παλαιᾶς ποιότητος*. In Miss Dawes' translation (London, 1928), p. 92, the sense of the passage is entirely distorted. See F. Chalandon, *Essai sur le règne d'Alexis 1^{er} Comnène* (Paris, 1900), p. 248.

are descriptive adjectives of various types, which differentiate the varieties and types of the two main species of coins.

The word დრახანი *drahkani* is employed in Georgian sources of the 11th century to designate the νόμισμα or bezant. The expression is presumably connected with the Armenian դահեկան *dahekan*¹ (= n. pers. *dahgān*), and philologically speaking is the archetype of the Arabic دينار *dīnār*. At a later period, when gold coins had been largely replaced by silver currency in the Near East, the term came to be used of a piece of silver:² we have here a parallel to the semasiology of the term florin in the west. Inasmuch, however, as the later memorials in our manuscript employ the term *perperay*, which, as we shall see, denotes a gold coin, even though debased, we can rest assured that in passages where the *drahkani* is mentioned, we are dealing with the bezant.

The term *drahkani* appears in some eighteen instances in our texts without any specific attribute attached to it.³ The majority of these were written by Io. Tablaysiaze. It is possible that the writer in some

¹ See H. Hübschmann, *Armenische Grammatik*, I, p. 133, no. 158. Whence the -r- in the Georgian form comes is a question. The development d)θr)r is not infrequent in Armenian (cf. Հրեայ *hreyay* Jew from the Syriac ܝܗܘܕܐ *yahūdāyā*), but not in Anlaut. One would suspect hybridization with δραχμή .

² So, for example, in Armenian Cilicia, where the *tahegan* (*dahekan* in the pronunciation of the local dialect, where surds and media both shift) is a silver coin. See V. Langlois, *Numismatique de l'Arménie au moyen âge* (Paris, 1855), pp. 10–11; and Pegolotti, ed. Evans, p. 59.

³ 11 (M.D.) Sabay and his brother Ioané Muhvc'ay — 100 drahkani; 34 (M.D.) Liparit gave to the church of the Virgin 100 drahkani and 76 more to the brethren (one apiece? — the phrase is not clear): 38 (Io.T'.) Grigol and Abaz Bakurianisdze — 200 drahkani each; 54 (Io.T'.) Arshiani — 150 drahkani; 62 (Io.T'.) brother Dzneli — 100 drahkani; 66 (Io.T'.) Ioané Kapanay — 100 drahkani protokharati; 70 (Io.T'.) brother Basil — 20 drahkani; 76 (Io.T'.) Symeon Eladay and his son Giorgi — property valued at one lb. of new drahkani; 77 (Io.T'.) Giorgi Dedop'leuri and his father Iované — 4 lbs. of drahkani; 78 (Io.T'.) brother Jerasime, 100 drahkani protokharagi; 84 (Io.T'.) T'eop'ane, the higumen of Petrici . . . another 100 drahkani; 86 (Io.T'.) Raysel and Varoz — 100 new drahkani; 102 (s. xii–xiii) Milaray and his brother K'obul . . . and also 50 drahkani; 103 (s. xvi–xvii) Mariame . . . also 200 drahkani; 112 (Io.T'.) P'antine of St. Basil . . . and 200 drahkani; 114 (Io.T'.) Op'idop'ay (Ὁφιδόφωτος?) — 246 drahkani; 118 Davit' the merchant — 105 drahkani; 125 (Io.T'.) brother Giorgi — velvets estimated at 100 drahkani protokharagi; 126 (Io.T'.) Kyriaké, Dimitri and Bart'lomé — 4 litrai of drahkani; 143 (s. xii) Ioané Kajakhisdze — 120 drahkani; 145 (not Io.T'.

cases may be giving a round figure. In two instances the word ძუელი *dzueli* "old" is added.¹

The პერპერა *perperay* is the Georgian form of the Greek ὑπέρ-περον, which was a gold coin introduced by Alexis Comnenus.² The expression appears in some cases in our text with a suffix — *perperati*, evidently by analogy with other coin appellations derived from imperial names.³ Under the Comnenian dynasty this coin became the dominant monetary unit. In some instances we find the term *drahkani* added to *perperay*. We can therefore infer that the memorials which contain this designation date from the period after 1083, when Alexis apparently issued the coin for the first time. It is abundantly clear from the specimens which survive and also from literary sources, that more than one species of the hyperperon was issued by Alexis,⁴ but the data in the ms. are not sufficiently precise to enable us to distin-

s. xii) Grigol and Ioané K'obulisdze . . . more than 1800 (89) *drahkani*; 153 (s. xii-xiii) Queen T'amara — two altar cloths each worth 20 *drahkani*.

¹ 134 (s. xii-xiii) Mik'el Laklak and Giorgi P'oč'olikay — 120 old *drahkani*; 138 (s. xii-xiii) father Ivane Kalakalay — 120 old *drahkani*. It is to be observed that these are relatively late memorials.

² The form *perpero* is also found in our Italian sources. 14 (s. xii-xiii) father Ioané Banc'uay — 15 *perperay*; 22 Mik'el, erstwhile father — 32 *perperay*; 33 (M.D.) Mik'el Kananakhi the priest — 30 *perperay*; 32 (s. xii-xiii) Petré the priest — 10 *perperay*; 39 (Io.T') Grigol and Ioané K'obulisdze — 900 *perperay*; 57 (Io.T') At'anasé gave *drahkani perperay* (no amount indicated!); 69 (Io.T') Meleti gave the monastery 20 *perperay*; 109 (Io.T') Baay Manoel by bequest 20 *perperay*; 144 (s. xii: ca. 1170 in time of abbot Pavlé) Nikolozí, preceptor of Symeon Čqondideli — in addition to many repairs to the monastery he also gave 24 *perperay*, a *mutruki* (მუტრუკი: an asses colt) bought for 15 *perperay*, and a yoke of oxen worth 7 *perperay*; 146 (s. xii) Ok'ropiri Kharaz — 1000 *perperay*; 150 (s. xii-xiii) Vardan Kostandisdze — 401 *perperay*; 148 (s. xii-xiii) Arseni Mardezisdze, khan babur of Tiflis — 38 *perperay*; 149 (s. xii) Abulasan of K'ut'ais — 40 *perperay*. This last group are all by one hand; 158 abbot Pavlé (ca. 1178) — 40 *perperay*; 160 (same hand as 158) Abulasanidze Ok'ropiri — 60 *perperay*.

³ 45 (M.D.?) T'evdosi of Salonika, erstwhile dux (*duk?*) — 100 *perperati*; 122 (s. xii) Davit' the Syrian — 40 *perperati*; 124 (s. xiv-xv) Jerasimé and Ivané the priest — 20 *perperati* each; 128 (xii-xiii) Ivané P'op'khaysdze — 120 *drahkani perperati*; 135 (Io.T') Giorgi of Juaris C'ikhé — 50 *perperati*; 141 (s. xii) Nikola of Petrici — 70 *perperati*.

⁴ See Wroth, *l. c.*, Introduction p. lxii, and Zonaras 18. 22: cf. also F. Chalandon, *Alexis Comnène*, pp. 304 ff.

guish between them, nor to equate them with the known types. The memorials mentioning *perperati* seem to be posterior in date.

One further expression we meet with in the codex is not a coin name, as Khakhanashvili thought.¹ *ბოგობდო solimni* is certainly the late Greek *σολέμνιον* (lat. *solemnium*).² Precisely the same phrase is used in both places, and in both instances it refers to the same action of two crowned heads — of Constantine Monomachos (1042–54), and of King Bagrat IV of Abkhazia (1027–72). The scribe says: *šegük'mna solimni* “he established³ for us a *solimni*”: the following phrase refers to the abolition of the *დომობო dimosi*, which can only mean the tax *τὸ δημόσιον*.⁴ Du Cange defines *σολέμνιον*⁵ as a payment made to a monastery by an emperor on condition that masses be sung in his behalf henceforward by the cloister: see Suidas *s.v.* *σολέμνιον*: *ἡ παρὰ βασιλέως ἀναφαίρετος ὥρεα διδομένη ταῖς ἐκκλησίαις*; and *Glossae Basilicanae*: *τὰ ὑπὸ βασιλέως ἐν ἐκκλησίαις διδόμενα χάριν μνήμης*.

The term is equated in Justinian. *Nov.* 128⁶ with *σαλάρια*, and reappears in the legal documents of the Macedonian period. “*Salaria*” appears to have borne in Byzantine times the more general signification of gift. The occasion to which the memorials refer is described in the life of St. George the Athonite (c. 30–32, tr. Peeters, pp. 100–102).

A series of adjectives are also coupled with the two main expressions which are derived from the names of emperors.

Those which are mentioned with *drahkani* are:

(1) *დუკატო dukati* = *Δουκάτης*⁷

¹ Introduction, p. vi.

² Nos. 15, 100.

³ *შეგობდა* in Georgian — *create* as opposed to *შობდა facere*.

⁴ On this tax see J. B. Bury, *The Eastern Roman Empire*, p. 212 f.

⁵ *Glossarium ad scriptores Graecos*, t. II, col. 1405–6.

⁶ Ed. Zachariä von Lingenthal, II, p. 282: *σολεμνίους ἢ σαλαρίους* (no. CLII).

⁷ 4 (Io.T.) Arseni Qivč'aki — 20 *drahkani dukati*; 7 Ap'enilé, the mother of Makharebeli — 20 *dukati*: the date of this memorial is uncertain: “when Kondostep'ane (*Κοντοστέφανος*) took away our villages at Constantinople”; 137 (s. xii) Arseni the monk — 32 *drahkani dukati*; 141 (s. xiii) Nikola of Petrici — 42 *dukati* for grain; 153 (s. xii–xiii) Queen T'amara (1174–1215) — 20 *dukati*.

The material on this term is distinctly indefinite. In all instances we must rule out the Venetian ducat, whose coinage commenced in 1283 only. Even if no. 7 does belong to the period of the Latin Empire (it may refer to the admiral Kon-

- (2) ჰრომანატი *hromanati* = 'Ρωμανάτης¹
 (3) დუკადმიკაილათი = Δουκαμικηλάτης²
 (4) ვოტანიოტი = Βοτονειάτης³

These four terms refer, it would seem, to the four emperors who immediately preceded Alexis Comnenus, namely, Constantine X Ducas (1059–67): Romanus IV Diogenes (1067–71); Michael VII Ducas (1071–78), and Nicephorus Botoneiates (1078–81). The depreciation of the bezant would thus appear to have started under Constantine Ducas, or in any case to have then become sufficiently marked to bring about oscillations in its purchasing power. Wroth notes definite debasement, first of all, under Nicephorus Botoneiates,⁴ whose coins show a wide variation on weight and many of them a considerable proportion of base alloy, but we have, so far as I know, no systematic series of analyses of the coinage of this period, and it may well be that debasement actually occurred earlier. If my memory serves me correctly, these four varieties are especially listed by Di Pasi (in the 1545 edition).⁵ The Georgian materials show that this was also the case in

dostephanos, cf. Anna Comnena, *Alexias* 12, 8 ff. (ca. 1106)), Venetian coins cannot come into the picture. The term must refer to one of the emperors of the house of Ducas: these can only be Michael VIII or Constantine X. Inasmuch as Michael's coins are termed *dukad-mikaylati* in our memorials, the reference can only be to Constantine. I am inclined to think that full-weight or high-value bezants are here implied. Gold currency remains long in circulation, and its availability at a later epoch should not surprise us.

¹ One reference occurs: 51 (Io.T'.) T'evdoré the Syrian — 100 drahkani hrom-nati.

² 43 (Io.T'.) father Ioané Buk'aysdze — 24 dukad-mikhaylati; 44 (another hand) the ancient Giorgi Jubieli — 50 drahkani dukad-mikhailati; 97 (s. xii) Giorgi Koshkinay — 20 dukad-mikhaylati (დუკად — *dokad-sic*).

³ 30 (s. xii–xiii) brothers Ioané and Mik'el — 1 lb. of drahkani votaniati; 159 (s. xii) Anasuilé and her son Iaghi — 100 drahkani botanioti.

⁴ Wroth, *l. c.*, p. lxii.

⁵ The handbook of the Venetian Bartolomeo di Pasi went through a number of editions (cf. W. Heyd, *Histoire du commerce au Levant au moyen âge* (Leipsic, 1883), vol. I, p. xix). In the Harvard College Library are those of 1503 and 1542, but no data on coins appears to be included in them. I recall, however, extracting sundry bits of information from a later edition (I believe it was the one mentioned in the text), when I was a student at Petrograd.

Byzantium during the 11th century, and likewise afford us a *terminus a quo quem non* for those particular memorials.

Some interesting comparative materials are afforded by tenth and eleventh century South Italian documents, to which the writer's attention has been called by Dr. Allan Evans. From the materials in the *Codice Diplomatico Barese*, we can infer that in South Italy the older full-value nomisma was called *constantino*. As this appellation is attached to the coin in a document of the year 957 (*ibid.*, p. 5), the name must refer in South Italy to Constantine IX Porphyrogenetos. We have a series of references to these coins during the 11th century down to 1074. In some instances descriptive adjectives are attached to them: in addition to being *boni* and *veteres*, they are called *sotirichi* (i.e., with the figure of the Σωτήρ), *thoriati* (*thoricati* from θώραξ?), and *olotrachi*, which seems to be a hybrid form from Greek ὄλος and Latin *-trahus*. The scyphate form of coin is also mentioned.

The *miliarensis* also occurs in these documents, which coin does not figure in our Athonite materials.

The second name which appears in Apulian documents is the *romanato* (1036 — twice; 1039 — *romanati maiores*; 1117). In the first three instances the reference must be to Romanus III Argyrus (1028–34), but the last instance can only refer to Romanus IV Diogenes (1067–71). As Romanus III's coins are of full weight, the recorder apparently wished to show that the coins were new.

Finally *micelati* are mentioned (1099, 1110, 1117, 1126). The dates show that the coins must be those of Michael Ducas (1071–1079).

The coin lists in Pegolotti, Giovanni da Uzzano and some unpublished ones which Dr. Evans expects to edit, do not register any regnal appellations, but mention only *perperi* and *bisanti* of various types, frequently described in some detail, but dating, it would appear, from a period distinctly later than that which concerns us here.

The only regnal epithet coupled with the hyperperon is ალექსანდრო¹ *alek'sati*, which obviously refers to Alexius Comnenus (1081–1118), and this confirms the fact that the memorials written by Iované T'ablaydsze date from before 1116.

¹ 42 (Io.T') Ivané Sisikoneli and his two brothers Grigol and Giorgi — 280 drahkani stamenoni alek'sati; 43 (Io.T') father Iované Buk'aysdze — 144 drahkani stamenoni alek'sati; 79 (Io.T') T'eodoré — 2 lbs. protokharagi alek'sisay.

A second group of expressions appears to refer to the state of the coins:

(a) პროტოქარატი *protokharati* or პროტოქარაგი ¹ *protokharagi*, which terms appear to imply a Greek prototype $\pi\rho\omega\tau\omicron\chi\acute{\alpha}\rho\alpha\tau\tau\omicron\varsigma$ or $\chi\acute{\alpha}\rho\alpha\gamma\omicron\varsigma$. I have not found the compound adjective anywhere in Greek sources, but the forms $\chi\acute{\alpha}\rho\alpha\gamma\mu\alpha$ and $\chi\alpha\rho\alpha\gamma\eta$ are employed in Byzantine texts in the sense of coined money. Theophanes² uses both terms in the same passage, so it would appear that they were used interchangeably. $\chi\acute{\alpha}\rho\alpha\gamma\mu\alpha$ is used repeatedly in the conversion table of coins issued under Alexius Comnenus,³ and is also deprecatingly mentioned by Anna Comnena. From the passages cited, the form $\chi\alpha\rho\alpha\gamma\eta$ seems to be the more vulgar. The term $\chi\alpha\rho\acute{\alpha}\tau\iota\varsigma$ which Du Cange equates with $\chi\acute{\alpha}\rho\alpha\gamma\mu\alpha$ is nothing more or less than the arabic خَرَّاج *kharāj*. The term obviously means “coins in mint condition.”⁴

(b) ქინატი *k'inati*. This is a more difficult problem: I am inclined to equate it with $\chi\omega\nu\epsilon\tau\omicron\varsigma$ “cast, refined” (of coins), but the vocalization of the first syllable causes difficulties.⁵ If the explanation advanced is correct, the reference would be to coins of a high gold content.⁶

(c) სტამენი *stamenoni*. We are certain what this word means. Du Cange *s.v.* $\sigma\tau\acute{\alpha}\mu\epsilon\nu\omicron$ ⁷ quotes a number of examples from the Prodromic poems and from vulgar Greek romances, but the fullest definition is given by the Florentine Pegolotti:⁸ “E spendesi un'altra moneta ch'è tutta di rame che

¹ In this instance it should be noted that Greek χ equals Georgian ხ *kh*: customarily χ is represented in Georgian by ქ — *k'* in accordance with the Syro-Armenian tradition, e.g., ქრისტე *K'ristey* = $\chi\rho\iota\sigma\tau\omicron\varsigma$.

² Theophanes A. M. 6183 ed. De Boor, p. 365. 10: $\tau\omicron$ σταλὲν $\chi\acute{\alpha}\rho\alpha\gamma\mu\alpha$ παρὰ $\text{Ἀβιμελὲχ νεοφανὲς ὃν καὶ μηδὲποτε γεγονὸς οὐ προσεδέξατο. . . 1. 15 . . . τῶν Ἀράβων μὴ καταδεχομένων τὴν τῶν Ῥωμαίων $\chi\alpha\rho\alpha\gamma\eta$.$

³ Ed. K. Zachariä von Lingenthal, *Ius Graeco-romanum* III (Lipsiae, 1857), pp. 385 f. See F. Chalandon, *Essai sur Alexis Comnène* (Paris, 1900), pp. 302 f.

⁴ 26 (M.D.) Basil the eparkhos and Basil the protonotarios — 3 lbs. of *protokharati*; 66 (Io.T') Ivané Kapanay — 100 *drahkani protokharati*.

64 (Io.T') T'eop'ilak'té the tailor — 42 *protokharagi*; 78 (Io.T') father Jerasimé 100 *drahkani protokharagi*; 97 (Io.T') T'eodoré — 2 lbs. of *protokharagi* of Alexis; 138 (s. xii) the archpriest Ioané T'ablaysdze (our scribe) — 30 *k'inati protokharagi*; 125 (Io.T') brother Giorgi — 100 *drahkani protokharagi*.

⁵ Note that if this etymology be true, $\chi = \text{ქ}$ = *k'*, in contrast to the term just discussed.

⁶ 41 (Io.T') the ancient Klimi — 1 lb. of *k'inati*; 120 (Io.T') Sumbat Kurapalat and Mariam — 1 lb. of *drahka (sic) k'inati*; 136 (s. xii) Ivané T'ablaysdze the archpriest — 120 *k'inati protokharagi*.

⁷ *Glossarium*, t. II, col. 1427.

⁸ Ed. Evans, p. 40.

si chiamano stanmini, e il tornese picciolo si conta per quattro stanmini, ma a questi stanmini non si fa nullo pagamento se none in passaggio di Costantinopoli per lo paese, e per erbe e cose minute.” In my estimation the word is simply *ιστάμενα*, i.e., coins sold by weight.¹ In other words, donors of this type of currency probably arrived at the monastery with sacks full of small change.²

A third category of epithets might be called descriptive, and refer to the design on the coin itself:

(a) ექუსთავი³ *ek'ust'avi* “six-header” probably represents the Greek *ἑξακέφαλον*. The only coin with six heads upon it in the Byzantine currency of this period is the nomisma of Romanus Diogenes and Eudocia Makrembolitissa, on which we have represented:

<i>Reverse</i>	<i>Obverse</i>
Michael	Romanus
Constantine	Jesus
Andronicus	Eudocia
(the sons of Eudocia)	

Compare the reproduction of this coin in Wroth, *l. c.*, II, pl. LXI, 11 and 12.

(b) ტრიაკეფალი *triakep'ali* — *τριάκεφαλον*.⁴ This coin can be identified with less certainty than the preceding one, but I am inclined tentatively to equate it with the nomisma of Eudocia Makrembolitissa, issued when she was sole sovereign: cf. Wroth, *l. c.*, pl. LXI, 10. The two names seem to be connected, and the types ought not to be far apart chronologically.

(c) stavrobotonati would be the Greek *σταυροβotoνειάτης*.⁵ This expression must refer to some coin of Nicephorus Botoneiates, which was clearly marked with a cross. Type I of the nomisma of this monarch as reproduced by Wroth (pl. LXIII, 4) would seem to be the coin meant.

¹ Quoted by Evans *s.v.* *stanmini* in the glossary of his edition, p. 437.

² 42 (Io.T') Iované Sisikoneli and his brothers Grigol and Giorgi — 280 drahkani stamenoni alek'sat'i; 43 (Io.T') father Ivané Buk'aysdze — 144 stamenoni alek'sati; 65 (Io.T') Irisé P'urt'ukhalay — 20 lbs. of new stamenoni; 84 (Io.T') T'eop'ané of Petrici — 2 lbs. of stamenoni; 106 (Io.T') Mik'el Abrahamisdze — 300 drahkani stamenoni; 111 (Io.T') Abaz Bakurianisdze — 500 drahkani ek'ust'avi stamenoni; 120 (Io.T') Sumbat Kurapalat — 500 drahkani stamenoni . . . and one lb. of stamenoni; 146 (Io.T') Ok'ropiri Kharaz — 600 stamenoni; 30 (s. xii–xiii) brothers Ivané and Mik'el — 100 drahkani stamenoni.

³ 111 (Io.T') Abaz Bakurianisdze — 500 drahkani stamenoni ek'ust'avi. In this case we have a translation of the term.

⁴ 128 (Io.T') Ioané P'op'khaysdze — 100 triakep'ali; 141 (Io.T') Nikola of Petrici — 50 new triakep'ali. Note that we have here a transcription of the word.

⁵ 119 (Io.T') Iakob, in the lay world Iaqt' — 100 drahkani stavrovotonati.

One other designation remains obscure. The adjective *dimitrati* (Δημητριάτης) is coupled in four instances with the word *drahkani*.¹ As no Byzantine emperor ever bore this name, we have evidently to do here with a term for a coin on which was represented a figure of St. Demetrius. This I have not yet been able to identify, but, as the memorials appear to be late, the inference may be drawn that some issue of the Comneni is meant.

Sums are not infrequently stated in pounds ԼՐԹԱ (litray), sometimes with the addition of a monetary unit, sometimes without.²

The use of the term *gandzi* ցանձ (arm. ԳԱՆԾ *gandz*, gr. γάξα) is not infrequent in our memorials.³ We have already seen above that it is employed in Byzantine documents to some extent. In most instances it appears here as an estimate of value, but in some cases it may be actual plate. The term seems to cover gold and silver alike, as icons are frequently mentioned among the objects comprised in the gift,

¹ 3 (date uncertain) Arseni the Black — 2 mules worth 180 dimitrati; 59 (date uncertain) Davit' the priest — 200 drahkani dimitrati; 75 (s. xiv-xv?) Arseni T'evdorakani — 200 drahkani dimitrati; 136 (Io.T') Nikola the priest — 300 drahkani dimitrati.

The above materials raise a question in my mind whether no. 136 is really by Ioané T'ablaysdze, and Zhordania is wrong in his attribution. The coin is obviously a debased one.

² 15 (M.D.) Petrik and his brother Ivané — 1 lb. solimni; 20 (M.D.) Sanano K'velisdze — 1 lb. of gandzi; 26 (M.D.) Basil eparkhozi and Basil protonotari — 3 lbs. protokharagi; 30 (s. xii-xiii) brothers Ivané and Mik'el — 1 lb. votaniati; 41 (Io.T') the ancient Klimi — 1 lb. k'inati drahkani; 53 (Io.T') T'evdoré — 1 lb. of gandzi; 56 (Io.T') Giorgi Magistros — 40 lbs. of gandzi; 65 (Io.T') Irisé P'urt'-ukhalay — 20 lbs. of new stamenoni; 72 (Io.T') Kristep'oré Lalakay — 1 lb. of gandzi; 76 (Io.T') Symeon Eladisay and his son Giorgi — 3 lbs. of new drahkani; 77 (Io.T') Giorgi Dedop'leuri and his son Giorgi — 4 lbs. of drahkani; 79 (Io.T') T'evdoré — 1 lb. protokharagi alexisay; 84 (Io.T') T'oep'ané of Petrici — 2 lbs. of stamenoni; 92 (Io.T'?) Kyriaké the Kakhet'ian — . . . worth 3 lbs. of gandzi; 120 (Io.T') Sumbat Kurapalat and his wife Mariam — 1 lb. of stamenoni; 1 lb. of stamenoni; 7 lbs. of drahkani k'inati; 133 (Io.T') Mariam the queen and her son Kostantiné Porphyrogennetos — a solimni of 5 lbs., and 6 lbs. to divide among the brethren.

³ Most of the cases where treasure is mentioned have been assembled in the preceding note; cf. nos. 20, 53, 56, 72 and 92. To these we can add 50 (Io.T') Giorgi Č'orc'aneli, the brother of P'arsman — great treasures and rich cloths; 133 Queen Mariam and her son Constantine — gave treasure. On the Georgian and Armenian forms see Hübschmann, *Armenische Grammatik*, I, p. 126, no. 129.

and these were generally framed or covered with silver, in Byzantine, as well as in modern, times.

In addition to the sums in money and treasure not a few donations in kind or in goods are mentioned. For this the Byzantine *terminus technicus* was *ἐίδη*. These are varied in their nature, as one would expect, but fall into fairly well-marked classes, and for completeness' sake we shall list them here.

First of all we find gifts of food. The most important item is grain — gifts for the most part during periods of famine. Some contributions in money are noted as having been given in times of stress. The expression *პური puri* (lit. bread — *ἄρτος*) is used and should be understood as *σῖτος*, and translated as “wheat.” The Georgian had a special term for wheat *იქლი ip'k'li*, and another *ხუარბლი khuarbli* (used in the text), which denote the species as contrasted with other grains, such as *ქრთილი k'rt'ili* barley: in the modern language this term has gone out of use, and wheat is *წმინდა პური cminda puri*, “pure bread,” or even just *პური puri*. Halvá is likewise mentioned — probably rahat lukum in its moist, primitive form — familiar to all those who have visited Mt. Athos. Some other scattering food-stuffs occur. Wine, however, is noticeably absent from the list.¹

Second come gifts of an ecclesiastical nature. Among these are icons, altar-cloths, vestments, mantles, scaramangia (why?), patens, chalices and other church utensils. Here, too, we may mention manuscripts.²

¹ 2 (M.D.) Bishop Leon — a loan to us in wheat, rye and barley of 60 modia; 135 (s. xii) Giorgi of Juaris C'ikhé — grain; 103 (Io.T') Mariam — grain.

² Manuscripts: 5 Symeon Kherkeli — 4 mss.; 22 Mik'el erstwhile father — silver-bound gospels and Praxapostle; 32 Petré the priest — 12 in 7 volumes; 47 Ivané erstwhile Rus — 5 mss.; 139 Giorgi of Juaris C'ikhe — mss.

Icons and ecclesiastical vessels: 41 the ancient Klimi — an icon with relic inside; 43 father Ivané Buk'aysdze — a cross of gold; 56 Giorgi Magistros — vessels of silver; 92 Kyriaké the Kakhetian — ornaments worth 3 litray; 103 Mariam — one paten; 104 Basil, erstwhile Vač'e — an icon; 115 the proedros Lulu — a cross (*juari*; the edition has *jori*, a mule) “which we sold for 1700 perperati” and a basin of silver for the church worth 60 *ჭაგა*; 118 Davit' the merchant — a silver paten; 120 Sumbat Kurapatat — 2 patens. Cloths, drapes and garments: red cloth (prob. for wall hangings) (*კუმაშო kumashi*; russ. кумаць); 48 Gabriel Evanezisdze; 50 Giorgi Č'orč'aneli: brocades (*stavray*) velvets (*ek'samitoni*, *p'arč'i*) — 56, 92, 120, 125, 150, 155, scaramangion — 72; clothes 63, 81; 70 brother Basil — 2 millstones.

Aids to transportation were gratefully received, both by sea and by land. Heavy transport on Mt. Athos, then as now, was carried by sea as far as possible: some of the cloisters are on the seashore, like Iviron itself, others on the higher ground. All have their *ἀρσηνάρι* on the strand. We have two instances of the gift of a ship in our documents (8, 158). Land transport is also important, however, and horses and mules figure largely, also oxen. The quality and type of the animals are also noted, and as a good mule was worth 7 nomismata, such a gift was not an inconsiderable one.¹

Lastly, as far as gifts of land were concerned, these are not generally enumerated in our sources (cf. 6, 14, 60). T'ornik's benefactions form an exception to this rule, but here our data come from the *Vita Euthymii*. By implication, however, single donations do appear, as in a number of instances, the whole or part of the estate of a deceased magnate was left to the cloister. Repairs to the cloister were equally appreciated, and intervention with the great ones of this world was recorded even as gifts in money and land.²

In contrast to the 11th century coins we have discussed above we

¹ 31 (s. xii) Ibniani — 2 horses; 41 (Io.T'.) the ancient Klimi — 2 horses with saddle and bridle; 53 (Io.T'.) T'evdoré — 2 chargers; 55 (Io.T'.) Liparit the son of Ivané — 2 horses; 63 (Io.T'.) Symon the notary the Georgian — horses and oxen and labour (*našromi*); 70 (Io.T'.) brother Basil — 2 horses; 72 (Io.T'.) K'ristep'oré Lalako — 1 mule; 81 (Io.T'.) Iované erstwhile Lulu — 1 good horse; 102 (s. xii) Milaray and his son K'obul — 2 mules and 1 horse; 111 (Io.T'.) Abaz Bakurianisdze — 7 horses and mules; 128 (s. xii-xiii) Iované P'op'khaysdze — 2 horses; 140 (s. xii) Mosé the Georgian — 3 good horses; 141 (s. xii) Nikola of Petrici — 2 mules with saddle and bridle; 143 (s. xii-xiii) Iované Kojikhisdze — 1 mule. Apparently 3 milch cows (*p'urni khboredni*) valued at 3 lbs. of new drahkani were given by Symon Eladisay and his family (76); in view of the prohibition of females on Mount Athos, this seems a peculiar gift, if I have understood the expression correctly.

² Records of influence, estates, and buildings:

Influence

7 Apénile, mother of Maxharebeli exerted pressure in Constantinople; 15 Petrik and his brother Ivané — influence with K. Bagrat; 20 Sanano K'velisdze — influence with K. Bagrat.

Estates

10 Saba, in lay world Monomakh — whole estate; 32 Mik'el — all his estate; 98 Leon Epistates — estate; 112 Pantiné of St. Basil — ½ estate; field of 500 modii

can note in conclusion the mention of Osmanly currency (ოზმანურნი *ol'manuri*) in a late memorial (162: a. 1498). This text mentions a gift of 25,500 piastres from Quarquaré, the at'abeg of Meskhia, a border state which was leading a parlous and troubled existence between Turkey and Persia. It is interesting that the gift partly consisted of gold florins (ფლურონი *p'luri*) partly of silver in the form of თეთრი *t'et'ri* (blancs: ἄσπρα: Turkish *aqçē* from *aq* white). Here we find ourselves in another economic world, akin to that which we encounter in the synodikon of Jerusalem, but a full consideration of this latter document must be deferred to another time and place.

The memorials in the codex of Iviron, brief and scattered though they are, afford us, as we have seen, some idea of the type and quantity of the donations which a rich and popular Byzantine monastery was likely to receive during the 11th century. They also contribute some valuable contemporary testimony as to the economic dislocation which was beginning to affect the empire, and enable us, I believe, to fix the inception of the period of inflation and illustrate some of its multifarious effects upon the economic life of the state.

added to it; 135 Giorgi of C'ikhis Juari — estate ($\frac{1}{4}$ according to 139?); 145 Grigol and Ivané K'obulisdze planted a 25 modia vineyard.

Buildings

33 Mik'el the priest Kananakhi — rebuilt burned cells; 43 father Iované Buk'-aysdze — good battlements on wall (bastion); 144 Nikolozi restored Church of Archangels and raised the tower; 145 the brothers K'obulisdze restored outer wall of cloister and the *μετόχιον* of St. Nicholas; 158 (s. xii) many reconstructions in the cloister by the great *οικονόμος* Giorgi.